DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 255 24 TE 499 835

AUTHOR	Norris, Eleanor L., Ed.; Goodwin, Barbara, Ed.
TITLE	National Assessment of Educational Progress: Art Objectives.
INSTITUTION	National Assessment of Educational Progress, Ann Arbor, Mich.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0771
PUB DATE	71
GRANT	OEG-0-9-08771-2468(508)
NOTE	33p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Assessment of Educational Progress Office, Room 201A Huron Towers, 2222 Fuller Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105 ($1.00; 10 or more-20% discount)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement, *Art Education, *Educational Objectives, *National Surveys

ABSTRACT

The results of the national assessment of progress in educational art objectives are given. Topics covered are procedures for developing art objectives and art objectives, per se. Appendices and names of organizations affiliated with the evaluation effort are included. (CK)

OE/NCERD BR8-0771
PA 24
TE/0

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED051255

national assessment

national assessment

national assessment

ED051255

National Assessment of Educational Progress

Art Objectives

TE 449 835

National Assessment of Educational Progress

Ann Arbor Offices:
Room 201A Huron Towers
2222 Fuller Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

Denver Offices:
822 Lincoln Tower
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

A Project of the
Education Commission of the States

ED062522

This publication was prepared pursuant to Grant No. OEG-0-9-08771-2468(508) with the National Center for Educational Research and Development, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Grantees undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1971
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 78-140262

Single Copies $1.00
Orders of 10 or more, 20% discount

National Assessment Office
Rm. 201A Huron Towers
2222 Fuller Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

PREFACE

The results released to the public by National Assessment in July, 1970, marked the initial reporting based on the first year's assessment of 9-, 13-, and 17-year-olds and young adults between the ages of 26 and 35. National Assessment is now under full-scale operation, and reports will be made continuously as the project collects data describing the knowledge, skills, and attitudes attained by groups of young Americans.

The periodic release of results by National Assessment represents only one aspect of the project. Behind each report lies a complex series of activities that has been completed through the cooperation and participation of thousands of specialists representing a wide variety of disciplines and a number of organizations specifically equipped to handle various operations. From developing educational objectives for a subject area to producing exercises that assess how well those objectives are being met, from constructing a broad and representative sample design to locating individuals in homes and schools throughout the nation for the assessment, from processing the mountains of data collected to finding meaningful ways in which the information can be presented—countless individuals have completed innumerable tasks before reports are ready for public release.

Nor are the reports that will be released in the next several years—when assessment in each of the 10 subject areas will be completed—in themselves the end result of the project. One of National Assessment's main purposes is to compare the educational attainments of groups of young Americans over time. An important use of the first data gathered for each subject area, therefore, is to provide benchmarks against which the results of subsequent reassessments may be compared to determine progress or decline.

The educational objectives for the area of art are presented here, along with an introduction to the history and goals of National Assessment. The procedures used in developing the art objectives and described in the second chapter of this brochure should provide an idea of the time and complexity involved in preparing objectives for each subject area. While the art objectives

are only one part of the overall project, they are a vital and important part. The careful attention given to their development and refinement is typical of efforts made in carrying out other National Assessment activities. The project is an evolving one, and each activity is subject to continuous reexamination and refinement as National Assessment attempts to provide all those interested in what young people are learning with valuable information on the outputs of the American educational system.

Eleanor L. Norris
Barbara Goodwin
Editors

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Procedures for Developing Art Objectives, *Brent Wilson* 4

III. Art Objectives 9

IV. Appendices
- A. ETS Staff Members Involved in the Development of Art Objectives 20
- B. Members of the Fine Arts Committee 21
- C. Chairmen of Lay Panels 22
- D. Members of the National Assessment Art Objectives Panel 23

Organizational Affiliation of Lay People Participating in ECAPE Conferences 24

Education Commission of the States: Directors and Executive Committee 25

National Assessment Policy Committee 26

National Assessment Staff: Directors 27

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The National Assessment is designed to furnish information to all those interested in American education regarding the educational achievements of our children, youth, and young adults, indicating both the progress we are making and the problems we face. This kind of information is necessary if intelligent decisions are to be made regarding the allocation of resources for educational purposes.

In the summer of 1963 the idea of developing an educational census of this sort was proposed in a meeting of laymen and professional educators concerned with the strengthening of American education. The idea was discussed further in two conferences held in the winter of 1963-64, and a rough plan emerged. The Carnegie Corporation of New York, a private foundation, granted the funds to get started and appointed the Exploratory Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education (ECAPE). The Committee's assignment was to confer at greater length with teachers, administrators, school board members, and other laymen deeply interested in education to get advice on ways in which such a project could be designed and conducted to be constructively helpful to the schools and to avoid possible injuries. The Committee was also charged with the responsibility for getting assessment instruments constructed and tried out and for developing a detailed plan for the conduct of the assessment. These tasks required four years to complete. On July 1, 1968, the Exploratory Committee issued its final report and turned over the assessment instruments and the plan that had been developed to the Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education (CAPE), which was responsible for the national assessment that began in February of 1969. In July, 1969, governance of the project was assumed by the Education Commission of the States, a compact of 43 states and territories whose purpose is to discuss and coordinate educational problems and activities. The work described here was conducted under the direction of ECAPE and CAPE.

In the early conferences, teachers, administrators, and laymen all

emphasized the need to assess the progress of children and youth in the several fields of instruction, not limiting the appraisal to the 3 Rs alone. Hence, the first assessment includes 10 areas: reading, writing (written expression), science, mathematics, social studies, citizenship, career and occupational development (originally called vocational education), literature, art, and music. Other areas may be added in the future. The funds available were not sufficient to develop assessment instruments in all fields of American education. The 10 chosen for the first round are quite varied and will furnish information about a considerable breadth of educational achievements.

Because the purpose of the assessment is to provide helpful information about the progress of education that can be understood and accepted by laymen as well as professional educators, some new procedures were followed in constructing the assessment instruments that are not commonly employed in test building.

These procedures are perhaps most evident and important in the formulation of the educational objectives which govern the direction of the assessment in a given subject matter area. Objectives define a set of goals which are agreed upon as desirable directions in the education of children. For National Assessment, goals must be acceptable to three important groups of people. First, they must be considered important by scholars in the discipline of a given subject area. Scientists, for example, should generally agree that the science objectives are worthwhile. Second, objectives should be acceptable to most educators and be considered desirable teaching goals in most schools. Finally, and perhaps most uniquely, National Assessment objectives must be considered desirable by thoughtful lay citizens. Parents and others interested in education should agree that an objective is important for youth of the country to know and that it is of value in modern life.

This careful attention to the identification of objectives should help to minimize the criticism frequently encountered with current tests in which some item is attacked by the scholar as representing shoddy scholarship, or criticized by school people as something not in the curriculum, or challenged by laymen as being unimportant or technical trivia.

National Assessment objectives must also be a clear guide to the actual development of assessment exercises. Thus, most assessment objectives are stated in such a way that an observable behavior is described. For example, one citizenship objective for 17-year-olds

is that the individual will recognize instances of the proper exercise or denial of constitutional rights and liberties, including the due process of law. Translated into exercise form, this objective could be presented as an account of press censorship or police interference with a peaceful public protest. Ideally, then, the individual completing the exercise would correctly recognize these examples as denials of constitutional rights. It should be noted, however, that exercises are not intended to describe standards which all children are or should be achieving; rather, they are offered simply as a means to estimate what proportion of our population exhibits the generally desirable behaviors implicit in the objectives.

The responsibility for bringing together scholars, teachers, and curriculum specialists to formulate statements of objectives and to construct prototype exercises was undertaken through contracts by organizations experienced in test construction, each responsible for one or more subject areas. In several areas the formulation of objectives was particularly difficult because of the breadth and variety of emphases in these fields. Hence, two contractors were employed to work on each of these areas, independently, in the hope that this would furnish alternative objectives from which panels composed of lay persons could choose. In some instances, subject matter experts were requested to do even further work with the objectives before they were accepted by CAPE.

This brief description of the process employed in identifying objectives for the first assessment should furnish a background for examining the sections that follow.

Chapter II

PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPING ART OBJECTIVES

Brent Wilson

National Assessment Consultant

The task of developing art objectives originally was awarded to the Educational Testing Service (ETS) of Princeton, New Jersey.[1] In the summer of 1965, 12 fine arts experts met with members of the ETS staff to define the nature and scope of objectives for art education.[2]

Before the work of formulating objectives actually got under way, the fine arts committee was provided with a review of materials about art objectives which had appeared in the professional literature. The ETS staff also provided committee members with guidelines to be used in writing art objectives. In addition to the three criteria established by ECAPE and listed in the introduction to this brochure, the fine arts experts were asked to keep several other important considerations in mind:

1. National Assessment would be directed toward four age levels–9-, 13-, and 17-year-olds, and young adults between the ages of 26 and 35. Parochial, private, and public schools would all be involved, ensuring that the assessment would be truly national in character.
2. The objectives and the exercises developed from them should focus on the whole range of possible achievements. To meet this need, they should include tasks that almost all of the population at a given age level could complete successfully, tasks that about half could complete successfully, and tasks that only the most knowledgeable or highly skilled could complete successfully.

---

[1]The names of the ETS staff members involved in the development of art objectives are listed in Appendix A.

[2]The names of the members of the fine arts committee are listed in Appendix B.

The committee's first concern was to develop a satisfactory definition of art. Art was broadly defined by the committee as "the visual expression of man's attitude toward life." In developing a working definition suitable for National Assessment purposes, however, the committee noted that " 'art' is limited, for the most part, to printing, drawing, sculpture, architecture, and the graphic arts (woodcuts, engravings, etchings, and lithographs) rather than to the applied arts (that is, decorative arts or arts of design) or to the complexities of aesthetics and the psychology of visual perception."

The fine arts experts used the definition which excluded the applied arts as a guide in developing objectives for the area of art. At the end of the two-and-one-half-day meeting with ETS staff members, the committee had produced the following four major objectives:

1. Perceive and respond to aesthetic elements in art;
2. Recognize and accept art as a realm of experience and participate in activities related to art;
3. Know about art;
4. Form reasoned, critical judgments about the significance and quality of works of art.

The major aspects of art related to each of these objectives were explained in a number of subobjectives prepared by the committee. However, the subobjectives for the third and fourth major objectives, which involve art history and critical judgments, respectively, were more specific than those developed for the first two objectives dealing with perception, attitudes, and production.

After the fine arts experts had completed their work, the ETS staff prepared a draft of their specifications. The objectives were sent to each committee member for review, and then to the Exploratory Committee for its consideration.

Throughout the planning for a national assessment, the Exploratory Committee–now the National Assessment of Educational Progress–has been well aware of the importance of involving the general public in the development of objectives and exercises. While it is not unusual for professionals to interact on such matters as objectives and tasks, it is rare to find nonprofessionals included in such discussions. To obtain the participation of lay persons actively interested in education, the Exploratory Committee asked for nominations from officers of various national and state organizations involved in education.

From these nominations, persons who lived in large cities, suburban communities, and rural, small-town areas throughout the

United States were selected to form 11 lay review panels. Each panel was chaired by one of its members and met for two days in its geographic area to consider and discuss subject area objectives developed for National Assessment.[3] A member of the ECAPE staff was present at each panel meeting to act as a resource person. All the objectives developed were considered by each panel, thus providing 11 independent reviews for all 10 subject areas. Following the individual panel meetings, the 11 chairmen were brought together for a meeting in December, 1965, to pool their recommendations to the Exploratory Committee.

At this time the lay panel chairmen suggested that the definition of art be broadened to include the applied arts. The chairmen also indicated that their respective committees felt more emphasis needed to be placed on objectives dealing with the production of works of art and other aspects of participation in art. Although the original objectives contained subobjectives dealing with these areas, their emphasis was minor compared to the objectives on knowing about and judging art. Some of the lay panels also recommended that non-Western art be considered by the art objectives and exercises.

The art objectives themselves were not changed to reflect the suggestions of the lay panels, but the recommendations made at the December, 1965, meeting were taken into account later as preparation of exercises for the art assessment got under way.

After the objectives for art (as well as other National Assessment subject areas) were initially developed, they were compared to other statements of objectives that had appeared in the educational literature during the past 25 years. Since the National Assessment objectives were prepared for a specific purpose, their wording and organization were somewhat more uniform than prior statements. However, it was possible to organize the previous statements in terms of their relation to National Assessment objectives. When this procedure was finished, it was clear that National Assessment had not produced "new" objectives in any subject area. Rather, these objectives were restatements and summarizations of those that had appeared over the last quarter of a century. This was a desired and expected outcome in that one criterion for National Assessment objectives was that they be central to prevailing teaching efforts of educators.

The objectives developed by the fine arts committee and the ETS staff were used as a guide in the preparation of art exercises

---

[3]The chairmen of the lay panels are listed in Appendix C.

from 1965 to 1969. During this period, art educators reviewed exercises written for the art assessment on four separate occasions. At each review session, the exercises were criticized as being narrow in scope and as not adequately reflecting the nature of art learning either in or out of school.

Finally, it was decided that if acceptable art exercises were to be constructed, the original art objectives must be revised. Although the initial objectives were generally considered to reflect the major outcomes of art education, they often failed to indicate the specific behaviors that art exercises should assess. Also, several objectives recognized as major goals of art education were given the somewhat low priority of subobjectives in the original specifications prepared in 1965. Finally, since art, unlike many subject areas, does not have a long tradition of ways in which achievement can be assessed or measured, exercise writers had few models and guidelines to help them in their task. When they turned to the original objectives for direction, they often found no hints of the kinds of exercises that might be constructed.

In the spring of 1969, National Assessment asked the author to undertake the work of revising the art objectives. He was asked to rewrite the original objectives in more specific and behavioral terms so that they would serve as an effective guide for exercise writers. He also was requested to complete the revision in such a manner that the objectives would reflect the informal art education that arises through home and travel experience and through contact with the mass media and the general environment.

In May, 1969, a new panel of art experts and educators reviewed the revised objectives.[4] The panel suggested that the operational definition of art be expanded to include the environmental arts (for example, architecture and city planning) and the popular arts (such as comic strips, advertisements, and greeting cards), and recommended that major objectives be created for the production of art and attitudinal aspects of experiencing art. The panel members also recommended which objectives and subobjectives should receive primary emphasis when exercises were developed.

Following the May review, the revised objectives were refined to incorporate the panel's suggestions. During the summer of 1969, the art objectives were given an individual review by each panel member, and suggestions were again incorporated. When this

[4]The members of the National Assessment art objectives panel are listed in Appendix D.

process was completed, the author's work was accepted as the revised statement of National Assessment art objectives.

The objectives presented in the next chapter of this brochure serve as the basis for art exercises now being developed. They represent the efforts of the original fine arts committee, the ETS staff, the lay panels, the author, and the National Assessment art objectives panel.

The work of developing art objectives is not ended, however, for as the goals of the educational system themselves change, so must the objectives used by National Assessment. This means that there must be a continual reevaluation of the objectives for each of the subject areas included in the assessment. Following the first assessment of art in 1974-75, National Assessment will begin the process of reviewing the objectives in preparation for subsequent years, again requesting the assistance of both experts and lay persons in determining whether the objectives need to be modified. Through this continuing process of reexamination and reevaluation, National Assessment attempts to attain its goal of providing information on the correspondence between what our educational system is attempting to achieve and what it is, in fact, achieving.

Chapter III

ART OBJECTIVES

It is held that National Assessment should take a broad view of the nature of art and art education. Just as Morris Weitz maintains that art is an open concept for which it is impossible to name the necessary and sufficient properties,[1] it might also be maintained that the theories of art education that sometimes grow out of theories of art are just as open. At the very least, an assessment of art should recognize that there are numerous theories of art education, and that these theories affect art educational practices to greater and lesser degrees. Since these theories provide the direction by which art is created and analyzed, and the criteria by which it is evaluated, an effort has been made to consider a number of influential theories of art education in constructing the art objectives developed for National Assessment.

Although it would be impossible to develop a definition of art that satisfies all art educators, it has been necessary, for purposes of National Assessment, to establish an operational definition. As understood in the development of objectives, art refers to objects and experiences with objects such as the following: painting, drawing, sculpture, the graphic arts (woodcuts, engravings, etchings, and lithographs, for example), photography, films, assemblages, collages, mobiles, and happenings. The term also refers to crafts (pottery, weaving, jewelry, and metal work), the environmental arts (architecture, city planning, landscape architecture, interior design, and product design), and the popular arts (advertisements, television commercials, clothing, record covers, and comic strips).

Each of the objectives listed below merits some treatment at all age levels considered in the assessment. However, behaviors supporting the objectives may vary in emphasis across age levels. Some behaviors listed for a given objective are inappropriate for certain age levels and would be assessed only at ages where research indicates they are important.

I. PERCEIVE AND RESPOND TO ASPECTS OF ART

Aspects of art are defined as: sensory qualities of color, line, shape, and

[1]See Morris Weitz, "The Nature of Art," in Eisner and Ecker, *Readings in Art Education* (Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdel, 1966), pp. 49-56.

texture; compositional elements such as structure, space, design, balance, movement, placement, closure, contrast, and pattern; expressive qualities such as mood, feeling, and emotion; subject matter, including (1) objects, themes (the general subject of a work, i.e., landscape or battle scene), events, and ideas (general presymbolic meanings) and (2) symbols and allegories; and expressive content, which is a unique fusion of the foregoing aspects.

A. *Recognize and describe the subject matter elements of works of art.*

Age 9

1. Identify the objects in specific representational works of art.

2. Describe how the treatment of objects in two or more specific representational works of art is similar or different.

3. Identify themes of specific works of art.

4. Identify events depicted in specific works of art.

5. Describe how the themes of two or more specific works of art are similar or different.

6. Describe the main idea presented in a specific work of art.

Age 13 (in addition to Age 9)

1. Identify some of the conventional symbols commonly depicted in works of art.

2. Translate the meaning of conventional symbols commonly depicted in works of art.

Ages 17, A (in addition to Age 13)

1. Describe how the treatment of the theme or idea of two or more works of art is similar or different.

2. Identify objects that have two or more meanings in works of art.

3. Interpret the levels of meaning of objects in works of art.

4. Identify allegories depicted in works of art.

5. Interpret the meaning of allegories.

B. *Go beyond the recognition of subject matter to the perception and description of formal qualities and expressive content (the combined effect of the subject matter and the specific visual form that characterizes a particular work of art).*

Age 9

1. Describe the characteristics of sensory qualities of works of art (that is, tell about colors, shapes, lines, and textures in a painting, building, photograph, etc.).

2. Describe the differences between sensory qualities of two or more works of art.

3. Describe the expressive character (feelings and moods) of works of art.

Age 13 (in addition to Age 9)

1. Select from a group of works those that show such things as the most movement, stability, simplicity, complexity, etc.

2. Select works that are similar or different in expressive character.

3. Diagram the major compositional features of works of art.

4. Select works that are similar or different in composition.

5. Describe the major compositional features of works of art.

Ages 17, A (in addition to Age 13)

1. Describe the differences in expressive character among works of art.

2. Describe how the sensory elements combine to give a work of art a particular expressive quality.

3. Describe how compositional features contribute to a work's expressive quality.

4. Describe how the formal and subject matter aspects function together to give a work of art its own expressive content.

5. Describe the similarities and differences in expressive content of two or more works of art.

II. VALUE ART AS AN IMPORTANT REALM OF HUMAN EXPERIENCE

A. *Be affectively oriented toward art.*

All Ages
1. Be openly expectant of enjoyment and enjoy experiencing works of art.
2. Consider it important to experience works of art.
3. Be emotionally responsive to the impact of works of art.

B. *Participate in activities related to art.*

Age 9
1. Visit art museums and attend exhibitions.
2. Visit school art displays.
3. Look at art in magazines and books.
4. Observe aesthetic objects in natural and man-made environments.

Age 13 (in addition to Age 9)
1. Read about art.
2. Buy art books and reproductions.
3. Produce art during leisure time.

Ages 17, A (in addition to Age 13)
1. Buy original works of art.
2. Travel locally and abroad with emphasis on seeing art.
3. Belong to art organizations and support art financially.

C. *Express reasonably sophisticated conceptions about and positive attitudes toward art and artists.*

Age 9
1. Express positive attitudes toward art.
2. Express positive attitudes toward the roles of the visual arts in our society.
3. Have empathy with artists.
4. Have some knowledge of the roles of the visual arts in our society.

Ages 13, 17, A (in addition to Age 9)

1. Describe the differences between handcrafted and manufactured objects.

2. Describe the differences between works of art and natural objects.

3. Accept sophisticated rather than naive conceptions of art.

D. *Demonstrate an open-mindedness toward different forms and styles of art.*

All Ages 1. Agree that art should exist in a variety of forms.

2. Agree that art should exist in a variety of styles.

E. *Demonstrate an open-mindedness toward artistic experimentation.*

All Ages 1. Agree that artists should experiment in various ways.

2. Agree that artists should explore the possibilities of various media.

III. PRODUCE WORKS OF ART

A. *Produce original and imaginative works of art.*

All Ages 1. Produce an imaginative work of art, such as an animal or other object that looks like no other object has looked before.

2. Given various forms or objects, invent new forms.

B. *Express visual ideas fluently.*

All Ages 1. Be fluent in generating ideas for works of art.

2. Be fluent in producing visual ideas.

3. Be fluent in the use of media.

4. Be fluent in composing visually.

C. *Produce works of art with a particular composition, subject matter, expressive character, or expressive content.*

Age 9 1. Produce a work of art that fulfills the intrinsic demands of a space or shape.

2. Produce a work of art containing specified subject matter.

3. Produce a work of art with a particular mood, feeling, or expressive character.

Age 13 (in addition to Age 9)

1. Produce a work of art with a particular mood, feeling, or expressive character.

   a. Produce a work that fits the mood of a poem or piece of music.

   b. Produce a work that shows a mood such as calmness, excitement, gaiety, or sadness.

   c. Produce a work (landscape, city, or town) that has a particular feeling such as coolness, loneliness, warmness, wetness, or spookiness.

2. Produce a work of art with meaning based on the use of established symbols.

3. Produce a work of art with meaning based on the use of new symbols.

4. Design a poster that advertises an event, product, etc.

5. Produce a work that has a particular type of order or variety.

6. Modify the form of an object to improve its aesthetic quality or functional character.

Ages 17, A (in addition to Age 13)

Produce a work of art that has a particular composition such as vertical, horizontal, diagonal, concentric, symmetrical, and asymmetrical; that uses deep or shallow space; or that has an open or closed composition.

D. *Produce works of art that contain various visual conceptions.*

Age 9 1. Demonstrate the ability to represent spatial conceptions (one person standing in front of another, something close and something far, a street and a building, etc.).

2. Demonstrate the ability to represent accurately (depict the essential attitude and position of a model and indicate such things as clothing patterns).

3. Produce an accurate reportage drawing.

4. Produce works in which the subject matter aspects indicate expressions and emotions (running, walking, falling, laughing, crying, anger, fright, happiness, etc.).

Ages 13, 17, A (in addition to Age 9)
Demonstrate the ability to represent an object from different viewpoints and under different light conditions.

E. *Demonstrate knowledge and application of media, tools, techniques, and forming processes.*

Age 9 (None)

Ages 13, 17, A 1. Perform processes such as coiling a pot, cutting and printing a linoleum block, mixing specific colors, etc.

2. Select the appropriate tools to accomplish certain tasks such as printmaking, clay modeling, etc.

IV. KNOW ABOUT ART

A. *Recognize major figures and works in the history of art and understand their significance. (Significance as it is used here refers to such things as works of art that began new styles, markedly influenced subsequent works, changed the direction of art, contained visual and technical discoveries, expressed particularly well the spirit of their age, and those considered to be the major works of major artists.)*

Age 9 1. Recognize well-known works of art.

2. Tell why well-known works of art are important or significant.

3. Name the artist who produced specific works of art.

Age 13 (in addition to Age 9)
Select the statement that best characterizes the significance of a work of art.

Ages 17, A (in addition to Age 13)
Explain why certain key works are considered to be important to the history of art.

B. *Recognize styles of art, understand the concept of style, and analyze works of art on the basis of style.*

Age 9
1. From a group select works of art of the same style.
2. Explain why two or more works of art are similar or different in style.

Age 13 (in addition to Age 9)
Answer questions about the concept of style.

Ages 17, A (in addition to Age 13)
1. Answer questions about the characteristics of specific styles.
2. Describe the common characteristics of works of art of the same style.

C. *Know the history of man's art activity and understand the relation of one style or period to other styles and periods.*

Age 9
1. Rank works of art (two to ten or twelve) in chronological order.
2. Place works of art in the time period in which they were produced.

Age 13 (in addition to Age 9)
1. Place works of art along a time line.
2. Identify the historical period during which works of art were produced.
3. Select the style name that most closely characterizes a work of art.
4. Explain why particular visual, conceptual, technological, and cultural advances had to occur before a certain work of art could be produced.

Ages 17, A (in addition to Age 13)
1. Recognize and understand similarities and differences in media, forming processes, tools, and techniques.
   a. Select the works in which similar media, tools, techniques, and forming processes were employed.

b. Describe the media, tools, techniques, and forming processes employed in producing particular works, and explain the advancements that preceded their use.

2. Infer why one work of art comes from a technologically more highly developed society than another.

3. Identify what important visual or expressive aspect is evidenced in a particular work of art that is not evidenced in other works that preceded it.

4. Select the most accurate statement about the culture which produced a particular work of art.

5. Select the most accurate statement about the functions of particular works of art.

6. Identify works of art that originated in particular cultures.

7. Match a description of a culture with a representative work of art of the same culture.

8. Infer the characteristics of a society that produced a particular work of art.

9. Identify a style of art that may have influenced specific subsequent styles.

D. *Distinguish between factors of a work of art that relate principally to the personal style of the artist and factors that relate to the stylistic period or the entire age.*

Age 9 (None)

Age 13
1. From a group of works of art of the same period, select those that were produced by one artist.

2. From a group of works of art of various periods, select those that were produced during the same period.

Ages 17, A (in addition to Age 13)
1. Select statements that most accurately characterize the similarities or differences between two works of art by different artists of the same style or period.

2. Describe the similarities or differences between two

works of art of the same style but produced by two different artists.

3. When presented with two works of art of the same style, but by two different artists, characterize the differences that might relate to the personality of the artist.

E. *Know and recognize the relationships that existed between art and the other disciplines of the humanities (literature, music, and particularly the history of ideas and philosophy) during a given period.*

Age 9 (None)

Age 13 1. Select the work of art that was produced during the same period as a piece of literature, poetry, or music.

2. Select works of art that were produced by societies holding particular ideas, philosophies, or religious beliefs.

Ages 17, A (in addition to Age 13)
Make inferences about the different natures of cultures based on groups of works of art from those cultures (such as from open and closed cultures and from highly developed and developing cultures).

V. MAKE AND JUSTIFY JUDGMENTS ABOUT THE AESTHETIC MERIT AND QUALITY OF WORKS OF ART

Statements of aesthetic quality are those that characterize the various aspects of a work of art, while statements of aesthetic merit are assertions about the degree of goodness or badness of the work. Justifications of aesthetic merit are based on criteria such as the degree to which the work is integrated and whether contact with the work results in a vivid and fused experience.

A. *Make and justify judgments about aesthetic merit.*

All Ages 1. Judge a work of art to be good or bad.

2. Give reasons why a work of art has or does not have aesthetic merit.

B. *Make and justify judgments about aesthetic quality.*

All Ages 1. Characterize the aesthetic quality of works of art.

2. Give reasons why a work of art has a particular aesthetic quality.

C. *Apply specific criteria in judging works of art.*

Age 9
1. Judge a work of art on the basis of whether its organization leads to feelings of pleasure or displeasure.

2. Judge a work of art on the basis of how well its various aspects relate to each other.

Age 13 (in addition to Age 9)
1. Judge a work of art on the basis of how well it creates a vivid and intense impression.

2. Judge a work of art on the basis of how well the artist has utilized the inherent qualities of a particular medium.

3. Judge a work of art on the basis of how well the artist has controlled his medium.

4. Judge a utilitarian object, an advertisement, or a building on the basis of how well it functions or fits a context.

Ages 17, A (in addition to Age 13)
Judge a work of art on the basis of how successfully it expresses aspects of the society in which it was produced.

D. *Know and understand criteria for making aesthetic judgments.*

Ages 9, 13
1. Discriminate among statements containing adequate judgmental criteria and those containing inadequate criteria.

2. Give adequate reasons for stating that any work of art has aesthetic merit.

Ages 17, A (in addition to Ages 9 and 13)
1. Explain why two or more works of art, although very different in appearance, are often judged to be of essentially the same aesthetic worth.

2. Explain why two or more works of art with essentially the same subject matter are often judged to be of very different aesthetic worth.

3. Describe personal biases that, although almost entirely unrelated to aesthetic quality, affect judgments of works of art.

Appendix A

ETS STAFF MEMBERS INVOLVED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ART OBJECTIVES*

Miss Scarvia B. Anderson, Director of Curriculum Studies

Mrs. Arleen S. Barron, Assistant to the Director, Curriculum Studies

Paul B. Diederich, Senior Research Associate

Thomas F. Donlon, Assistant Director of Test Development

John K. Hemphill, Director of Developmental Research

Stephen P. Klein, Associate Research Psychologist

Mrs. Francean G. Meredith, Assistant Examiner, Humanities Test Development

Chester A. Tanaka, Art Director and Technical Advisor, Publications

John A. Winterbottom, Senior Program Director, Graduate and Professional School Examinations

*Members' affiliations at the time they were involved in the project are indicated.

Appendix B

MEMBERS OF THE FINE ARTS COMMITTEE*

Nathan Broder, Associate Editor, *The Musical Quarterly*

Jay S. Harrison, Director, Literary Services, Columbia Records

Harold Haydon, Department of Art, University of Chicago

Mrs. Katherine Kuh, Art Director, *Saturday Review*

Siegmund Levarie, Department of Music, Brooklyn College

James Lyons, Editor, *American Record Guide*

Miss Diana M. Prior-Palmer, Director of Public Relations, National Council on the Arts

Robert L. Sanders, Department of Music, Brooklyn College

Emile H. Serposs, Director, Division of Music, Chicago Public Schools

Claus Virch, Associate Curator, Department of Paintings, The Metropolitan Museum of Art

Allen S. Weller, Dean, College of Fine and Applied Arts, University of Illinois

Frederick S. Wight, Chairman, Department of Art, University of California, Los Angeles

*Members' affiliations at the time they served on the committee are indicated.

Appendix C

CHAIRMEN OF LAY PANELS*

J. T. Anderson, President, Idaho School Trustees Association, Twin Falls, Idaho

Mrs. Leland Bagwell, President, Georgia Parent Teachers' Association, Canton, Georgia

Mrs. Gerald Chapman, Former School Board Member and State Legislator, Arlington Heights, Illinois

Jerry Fine, President of Board of Education, Inglewood, California

A. Hugh Forster, Lancaster, Pennsylvania

Mrs. Romine Foster, President, New York State Parent Teachers' Association, Pittsford, New York

Mrs. Verne Littlefield, Past President, Arizona State Parent Teachers' Association, Phoenix, Arizona

Herbert Rogin, School Board Member, East Brunswick, New Jersey

Milton S. Saslaw, Miami, Florida

Benton Thomas, Kansas City, Missouri

Richard E. White, Rochester School Board, Rochester, Minnesota

*Chairmen's affiliations at the time they served on the panels are indicated.

Appendix D

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSESSMENT ART OBJECTIVES PANEL*

Paul Arnold, Department of Art, Oberlin College

Del Dace, Art Supervisor, Ladue School District (St. Louis)

Miss Ruth Ebken, Director of Art, Pittsburgh Public Schools

Vince Lanier, Head, Art Education, University of Oregon

Mrs. June McFee, Director, Institute for Community Art Studies, University of Oregon

Miss Janet G. Moore, Cleveland Museum of Art

Ralph Smith, College of Education, University of Illinois

Miss Julia Schwartz, Art Education, Florida State University

Brent Wilson, School of Art and College of Education, University of Iowa

*Members' affiliations at the time they served on the panel are indicated.

ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION OF LAY PEOPLE PARTICIPATING IN ECAPE CONFERENCES

AFL-CIO
American Association of University Women
County Boards of Education
League of Women Voters
Local Boards of Education
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
National Association of State Boards of Education
National Citizens Committee for Support of Public Schools
National Conference of Christians and Jews
National Congress of Parents and Teachers
National School Boards Association
Parochial Educational Organizations
State Boards of Education
State and Local Governmental Committees on Education
State Parents and Teachers Associations
State School Board Associations
U. S. Chamber of Commerce

More than 3,000 scholars, teachers, subject matter experts, curriculum specialists, laymen, including members of school boards, and test specialists have been involved at various stages of formulating and reviewing objectives and prototype assessment exercises.

EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

Governor Russell W. Peterson (Delaware), Chairman, 1970-71

William J. L. Wallace, Vice Chairman

John E. Gray, Treasurer

Wendell H. Pierce, Executive Director

ECS Executive Committee

Governor Kenneth M. Curtis, Maine

Governor Tom B. McCall, Oregon

Governor Russell W. Peterson, Delaware

Governor Calvin L. Rampton, Utah

State Senator Bryce Baggett, Oklahoma

State Representative D. Robert Graham, Florida

John E. Gray, President, Security National Bank, Beaumont, Texas

Warren G. Hill, Chancellor of Education, Connecticut

Reverend Albert A. Schneider, Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of Santa Fe, New Mexico

William J. L. Wallace, President, West Virginia College

Richard D. Wells, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Indiana

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT POLICY COMMITTEE

James A. Hazlett, Chairman and National Assessment Administrative Director

George B. Brain, Chairman, National Assessment Advisory Committee

Mrs. Julia Rivera de Vincenti, Secretary of Labor, Puerto Rico

Leroy F. Greene, Assemblyman, California, Education Commission of the States

Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Publisher, Tulsa (Oklahoma) Tribune

William C. Kahl, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wisconsin

John W. Letson, Chairman, Operations Advisory Committee

Theodore D. McNeal, State Senator, Missouri

John W. Tukey, Chairman, Analysis Advisory Committee

Ralph W. Tyler, ECAPE Chairman, 1964-68

Stephen J. Wright, Consultant to the President, College Entrance Examination Board

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT STAFF

Frank B. Womer, Staff Director

Miss Carmen J. Finley, Associate Staff Director, Director of Exercise Development

George H. Johnson, Director of Field Operations

Miss Eleanor L. Norris, Director of Information Services